



## State of Utah

### Department of Natural Resources

MICHAEL R. STYLER  
*Executive Director*

### Division of Oil, Gas & Mining

JOHN R. BAZA  
*Division Director*

JON M. HUNTSMAN, JR.  
*Governor*

GARY R. HERBERT  
*Lieutenant Governor*

September 26, 2006

CERTIFIED RETURN RECEIPT  
7004 2510 0004 1824 4028

Russell A. Larson  
Lakeview Rock Products, Inc.  
P.O. Box 540700  
900 North Redwood Road  
North Salt Lake, Utah 84114-0700

Subject: Initial Review of Notice of Intention to Commence Large Mining Operations,  
Lakeview Rock Products, Inc., Thomas Pit, M/011/002, Task ID# 1451, Davis  
County, Utah

Dear Mr. Larson:

The Division has completed our review of your draft Notice of Intention to Commence Large Mining Operations for the Thomas Pit, located in Davis County, Utah, which was received June 28, 2006. After reviewing the information, the attached comments will need to be addressed before tentative approval may be granted.

The comments are listed under the applicable Minerals Rule heading; please format your response in a similar fashion and **address only those items requested in the attached technical review** by sending replacement pages of the original mining notice **using redline and strikeout text**. After the notice is determined technically complete and we are prepared to issue final approval, we will ask that you send us two clean copies of the complete and corrected plan. Upon final approval of the permit, we will return one copy stamped "approved" for your records. Please provide a response to this review by October 20, 2006.

If you have any questions in this regard please contact me (538-5258) or Lynn Kunzler (538-5310) of the Minerals Staff. If you wish to arrange a meeting to discuss this review, please contact us at your earliest convenience. Thank you for your cooperation in completing this permitting action.

Sincerely,

Susan M. White  
Mine Program Coordinator  
Minerals Regulatory Program

SMW:LK:pb  
Attachment: Review  
P:\GROUPS\MINERALS\WP\M011-Davis\M0110002-ThomasPit\final\rev1-09202006.doc

## REVIEW OF NOTICE OF INTENTION TO COMMENCE LARGE MINING OPERATIONS

Lakeview Rock Products, Inc.  
Thomas Pit

M/011/002  
September 20, 2006

### **R647-4-105 - Maps, Drawings & Photographs**

*105.1 Topographic base map, boundaries, pre-act disturbance*

The plan states that the ultimate quarry will encompass 48.8 acres. The final pit floor will cover 21 acres, the highwalls 18 acres and the setback area 8 acres.

The total for these areas is 47 acres, the map included in the plan indicates that entire property will be impacted. Will the quarry impact the additional 1.8 acres of the property? (DJ)

Please include the access road that connects the Thomas Pit to your Beck Street operation. (LK)

Please identify on the map the areas to be disturbed, also, the access roads (driveways) between the operation and the highway need to be included in the permit area. (LK)

### **R647-4-106 - Operation Plan**

*106.3 Estimated acreages disturbed, reclaimed, annually.*

Please include the acreage of the access road (refer to comments under R647-4-105.1). (LK)

*106.5 Existing soil types, location, amount*

If soils are deep, why will they not be salvaged for future reclamation? (LK)

The plan refers to the Natural Resources Conservation Service Soil Survey for Davis-Weber Area. Please provide a copy of the soil survey information appropriate to this area, including the soil map. (LK)

*106.6 Plan for protecting & redepositing soils*

Compliance with this rule cannot be evaluated until the soil survey information is provided. (LK)

### **R647-4-107 - Operation Practices**

*107.1 Public safety & welfare*

*107.1.14 Posting warning signs*

Because of the proximity of housing to the quarry the Division suggests that the warning signs be placed at 100-foot intervals. (DJ)

*107.5 Suitable soils removed & stored*

Compliance with this rule cannot be evaluated until the soil survey information is provided. (LK)

**R647-4-109 - Impact Assessment**

*109.3 Impacts on existing soils resources*

Compliance with this rule cannot be evaluated until the soil survey information is provided. (LK)

*109.4 Slope stability, erosion control, air quality (fugitive dust control plan), safety*

The plan states that the quarry has obtained an air quality approval order for the quarry. Please include this document as a part of this application. (DJ)

**R647-4-110 - Reclamation Plan**

*110.2 Roads, highwalls, slopes, drainages, pits, etc., reclaimed*

Please provide plans for the reclamation of the road which connects the Thomas and Beck Street Pits. (LK)

*110.5 Revegetation planting program*

If seeding occurs shortly after ripping, there is no need to rake seed in. Leaving the area as rough as possible generally provides for greater vegetation establishment due to micro-water harvesting provided by the roughed surface. (LK)

**R647-4-111 - Reclamation Practices**

*111.12 Topsoil redistribution*

Until the soil survey data (see R647-4-106.5) and sufficient data to justify the requested soil variance (see R647-4-112), the Division cannot evaluate compliance with this rule. (LK)

**R647-4-112 - Variance**

*Two variances were requested with this Notice.*

1. Topsoil redistribution. The Notice does not contain sufficient data regarding soils to evaluate the need for this variance, nor does it adequately describe alternative measures demonstrating that it will be as effective as the rule. Until this is provided, the Division cannot evaluate this variance. (LK)
2. Revegetation. The Notice requests a lower vegetation success standard based on the expected interim or short term nature of the pit floor (expected to be developed into commercial/industrial use). This variance is not necessary, in the fact that should this alternative land use be realized prior to revegetation success, the post mining land use may be modified (along with the revegetation requirement) at that time. (LK)

The Notice also requests a variance to exclude the pit benches from meeting the revegetation requirement, stating that it would be "impractical to meet and impossible to measure". Please explain why this is and how it would be 'as effective as' the rule to which this variance applies. (LK)

**R647-4-113 – Surety**

The surety estimate includes a cost of \$405/ load for site clean-up. This is a cost that was quoted two to three years ago on other sites. With the increase in fuel & equipment costs, this figure should be reviewed to insure adequacy. The costs being used by the Division in an adjacent pit is \$600/load. (DJ)